

RECEIVED  
JUN 19 2012  
CLERK SUPREME COURT

FILED  
JUN 19 2012  
JANET JOHNSON  
CLERK SUPREME COURT  
BY: *[Signature]*

Rachel R. Alexander (020092)  
ALEXANDER BANKRUPTCY LAW FIRM  
5110 N. 44th Street, Suite 200L  
Phoenix, Arizona 85018  
Respondent Pro Per

THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF MEMBERS OF	)	PDJ – 2011-9002
THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,	)	
	)	
	)	EMERGENCY APPEAL FOR
Rachel R. Alexander,	)	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF
Bar No. 020092	)	TIME TO FILE OPENING BRIEF

Appellant requested an extension last week to file her opening brief. The lower disciplinary court denied her request today. The good cause for the request is as follows: Appellant has been attempting to obtain legal counsel from her prior employment at Maricopa County for the appeal. She has filed a Notice of Claim and a Declaratory action against the County requesting counsel but it has not been adjudicated yet. Appellant also requested an extension because she has become very ill with fibromyalgia due to stress from the proceedings.

Appellant asked Independent Bar Counsel (IBC) John Gleason if he would be willing to stipulate to an extension a week before her Opening Brief was due, and he told her it was premature, that she should wait to see if she could get counsel first. She asked him again last week before her Opening Brief was due and he denied her request to stipulate to an extension.

After IBC denied the extension, Appellant filed a Motion for Extension of Time a week ago. IBC filed an objection. IBC asserted that Appellant was asking for a lengthy extension

1 until her Declaratory Action against the County is complete. While it would be optimal for  
2 Appellant to conclude those proceedings in order to obtain legal counsel to assist with her  
3 appeal, Appellant was not asking for an "infinite" extension of time as IBC characterized it,  
4 but whatever length of time the Court deems fair. If Appellant will be required to represent  
5 herself, due to the complexity of the case (Appellant has 34 boxes of files from the lower court  
6 proceeding), this being an area of law Appellant is not proficient in, and Appellant's  
7 fibromyalgia, Appellant believes good cause exists for an extension of some length.

10 IBC asserted that Appellant had not shown why a delay in her appeal will not hurt the  
11 public. IBC previously stipulated to an extension of Appellant's suspension while she appeals,  
12 provided she works under the supervision of monitoring attorney Clint Bolick. IBC has  
13 essentially already agreed that Appellant does not represent a danger to the public since she is  
14 working under Bolick's supervision. Furthermore, the behavior Appellant is accused of is not  
15 related to harming her clients. Appellant now practices bankruptcy law.

18 Nevertheless, the lower court denied her motion for an extension of time. The lower  
19 court hints that Appellant may be intentionally causing delays. This is not true. Appellant did  
20 not file her Declaratory action against the County until until June 1<sup>st</sup> because she believed her  
21 Notice of Claim against the County, which she filed shortly after the lower court's decision,  
22 would have resolved the issue prior to that. Appellant is extremely concerned about her license  
23 to practice law and wants nothing more than to get her license reinstated, not misuse processes  
24 and make things worse. Appellant has never had a bar complaint before this in her 12 years of  
25 practicing law. Andrew Thomas testified in the lower court proceeding that no one had ever  
26  
27  
28

1 complained to him about Appellant in her five years of working at the County Attorney's  
2 Office.

3  
4 Appellant apologizes to the Court for citing the wrong statutes for requesting an  
5 extension of time; she is not skilled in this area of law representing herself and was relying  
6 upon the advice of a senior attorney who regularly practices appellate law. She has obtained  
7 more assistance since then from skilled attorneys who can assist her better.  
8

9 Appellant has been under a lot of attacks due to publicity from the trial, she has multiple  
10 stalkers who harass her over the trial and she had to get a restraining order against one, and her  
11 website has been hacked twice in retaliation over these proceedings. Her father has been in the  
12 emergency room twice recently. All these distractions have taken up an immense amount of  
13 time and Appellant merely wishes a slight extension to accommodate her.  
14

15 Finally, IBC granted Defendant Lisa Aubuchon an extension of time to file her Opening  
16 Brief. Aubuchon's bar license was revoked. Appellant's bar license was merely suspended. To  
17 grant an extension to Aubuchon but not to Appellant would be grossly unfair.  
18

19  
20 For these reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that the Court reverse the lower  
21 court's decision and grant her an extension to file her opening brief.  
22

23  
24 RESPECTULLY SUBMITTTED this 19th day of June, 2012.

25  
26   
27 Rachel Alexander  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

14 Pursuant to Arizona Rule of Special Actions 7e, I certify that the body of the attached  
15  
16 Appeal appears proportionately space typed of 14 points or more, is double spaced  
17 using Roman font and contains 710 words exclusive of Exhibits and signatures.  
18  
19

20  
21   
22  
23 Rachel Alexander  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

2 I certify that two copies of this Reply were served on the 19th day of June, 2012  
3 via electronic mail and via the United States Postal Service to the following:  
4

5 John S. Gleason  
6 1560 Broadway Suite 1800  
7 Denver, CO 80202  
8 Bar Counsel

9 Lisa Aubuchon  
10 8400 South Kyrene Suite 123  
11 Tempe, AZ 85284

12 By:   
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28